

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 20, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present Application. Claims 4-6, 19-32, 34 and 35 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 1-3, 7-14, 18 and 33 are rejected. Applicants are grateful for the Examiner's indication that claims 15-17 have allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18 and 33 have been amended, claim 12 canceled, leaving claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 14, 18 and 33 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments are at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 has been objected to by the Examiner because the repeated G' equations on Lines 5-6 of the claim appear to be in error. Claim 16 has been amended to obviate the above objection by amending the second occurrences of G' and G₀ to B' and B₀, respectively.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Drawing Objections

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Examiner states that the feature "at least one portion of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel having a width larger than other portions of the gate lines and data lines" of claim 10 must be shown or canceled from the claims.

It is respectively submitted that FIGS. 3C and 4C presently show this feature as originally filed. More specifically, FIGS. 3A-3C and 4A-4C delineate the red, green, blue and white pixels RP, GP, BP and WP, respectively with signal lines (i.e., gate and data lines) and FIGS. 3C and 4C depict the WP having a wider gate line in both FIGS. 3C and 4C and wider data lines in FIG. 4C.

Moreover, FIG. 10 is newly added figure illustrating an exemplary layout view of a TFT array panel for the LCD supporting pixels shown in FIG. 4C to overcome the objection with respect to the drawings more easily. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Substitute Specification

Minor typographical errors in the specification filed on September 10, 2003 were found in review of the same. Accordingly, a marked up and clean versions of a substitute specification are submitted herewith pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125. The amended specification includes a description for newly added FIG. 10. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 as failing to comply with the enabling requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner states that enablement of the claim limitation “wherein the data output unit outputs the optimized image signals by group of three optimized image signals” is questioned because all of the embodiments described in the specification show image signals output in groups of four. Claim 18 has been amended to change recitation of a group of “three” to a group of “four” optimized image signals.

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that in Lines 1-3 of claim 10, it is unclear what is meant by “at least one portion of the gate lines and the data lines”, “adjacent”, “width”, and also “other portions of the gate lines and the data lines”. Claims 1-12 have been amended to make clear that portions of the gate and/or date lines adjacent to the white pixel WP have a wider line width than other portions of the corresponding gate and data lines. Further, claim 11 has been amended to particularly point out that wider width line portions of the gate and data lines do not directly intersect with one another, such that wider width portions of respective intersecting gate and data line do not directly overlap one another.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to the claims under § 112, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 13 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,929,843 to Tanioka. The Examiner states that Tanioka discloses all of the elements of the claims. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 13 and 33 as amended recite, *inter alia*: wherein at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines and forming at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel having a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines, respectively. Tanioka does not disclose any variance in a line width of the gate or data lines. Thus, claims 13 and 33, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 14-18, define over Tanioka.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 13 and 33 under § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Japan Patent No. JP 2001-296523 to Tsutomu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,619,225 to Hashimoto. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Figures 1 and 7 of Tsutomu discloses all of the elements of the claim except *each pixel including a pixel electrode and a switching element*. The Examiner states this final element is disclosed in Figure 1(a) of Hashimoto. Regarding claims 2-3 and 7-9, the Examiner states that the elements of the claims are disclosed in Figure 1 of Tsutomu. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 as amended, from which claims 2, 3 and 7-9 depend, recite, *inter alia*: wherein at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines. Neither Tsutomu nor Hashimoto, either alone or in combination, disclose any variance in a line width of the gate or data lines. Thus, claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2, 3 and 7-9, define over Tanioka.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanioka in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. 20020196243 of Morita. The Examiner states that Tanioka discloses all elements of the claim in Figure 1 and 7 except *supplying the image signals to the data driver in synchronization with a clock; and a clock generator generating the clock, the data driver operating in synchronization with the clock*. The Examiner states these elements are disclosed in Paragraph 239 of Morita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 14 depends from claim 13, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Tsutomu as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of the alleged teachings of Tanioka or Morita do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Tanioka. More specifically, neither Tanioka nor Morita, either alone or in combination teach or suggest wherein at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data lines, as in amended claim 13 from which claim 14 depends. Thus claim 14, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 15-18, define over Tanioka in view of Morita.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-3, 7-9 and 14 under §103(a) be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-17 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in claims 15-17, but Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are allowable as depending upon allowable claim 13. As such, Applicant has not rewritten claims 15-17 in independent form at this time.

Applicant respectfully notes that original claims 10-12 are not rejected over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant assumes that original claims 10-12 contains allowable subject matter, but for the noted rejections thereto under § 112. If the Examiner's understanding is to the contrary, Applicant requests the Examiner to provide clarification with respect to claims 10-12 with respect to

the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____

/James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick 43,801
Confirmation No. 5378
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: September 20, 2006